REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 - 49 are pending.

Claims 1 - 49 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Moran et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,717,879 and Ludwig et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,802,294.

Respectfully, it is earnestly believed that the claims as originally filed distinguish over the cited art. Consequently, the claims have not been amended.

1. The present invention.

The present invention relates to information management during a collaborative effort. Claim 1, for example, recites a step of recording the activity among participants. Then, in an identifying step, a participant directive is identified "by analyzing said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing, said participant directive representing an action on said information desired by a participant of said meeting." A participant directive indicates an action to be taken on some information. There is a step of "effectuating said participant directive" so that the identified participant directive is acted upon to effect the indicated action.

2. The reference to Moran et al.

As understood, Moran et al. disclose a system "for the capture and playback of temporal data representing a collaborative activity such as a meeting." *Abstract.* "Events are contained within a timestream that represent natural activities that occurred during the course of the session." *Id.* They "create indices into the meeting recording of a collaborative activity that are a natural by-product of the activity itself. ... such as the change of a speaker, writing on and manipulating markings on a whiteboard or the taking of a note." *Col. 5, lines 19 - 27.*

"Playback of a session is performed under the control of a session access device. Coupled to the session access device are a plurality of players for playing back timestreams. The session access device utilizes event information to create a user interface for controlling session replay. The user interface is comprised of a plurality of windows. Each window may represent a player, a playback controller or an editor." *Abstract.*

3. The reference to Ludwig et al.

As understood, Ludwig et al. describe a multimedia collaboration system that integrates separate real-time and asynchronous networks. It is interoperable across different computer and network operating system platforms and closely approximates the experience of face-to-face collaboration. *Abstract.* Ludwig et al. describe "computer hardware, software and communications technologies are combined in novel ways to produce a multimedia collaboration system that greatly facilitates distributed collaboration, in part by replicating the benefits of face-to-face collaboration. The system tightly integrates a carefully selected set of multimedia and collaborative capabilities, principal among which are desktop teleconferencing and multimedia mail." *Col. 2, lines 59 - 64.*

4. The cited references do not teach "identifying ... participant directive."

An aspect of the present invention is "identifying a participant directive ..., said participant directive representing an action on said information." *Claim 1.* Moran et al. describe recording a collaborative activity. The discussion in column 18, describes players and editors shown in Fig. 4. Moran et al. do not teach in Fig. 4 identifying a participant directive wherein the participant directive represents an action on said information.

Columns 18 - 20 discuss the notion of a timeline interface, and the basic areas in a timeline window shown in Fig. 5. Moran et al. mention that the timeline interface provides playback control through interaction with a representation of events along a timeline. *Col. 18, lines 47 - 49.* "Events are data representing an occurrence, e.g. a switch in speakers or writing on a whiteboard, that happen at some point or interval during an activity being captured." *Col. 6, lines 19 - 22.* Column 20 also describes Figs. 6 and 7, which illustrate display re-sizing. Events as defined by Moran et al. do not constitute the participant directives recited in the pending claims.

Figs. 8 - 10 are described in columns 20 - 21, and relate to the display of multiple sessions. The discussion of Figs. 8 - 10 does not relate to identifying a participant directive as recited in the pending claims.

Figs. 11 - 14 show variations on the timeline display, and are described in columns 21 - 24. The Office action notes at the bottom of page 2 that Moran et al. disclose providing each meeting participant with "a button that may be depressed when the participant feels that something significant is being discussed. [T]he visual indicators are color coded to identify the person who depressed the button." *Col. 22, lines 14 - 18.* It is earnestly submitted that a button press simply signals "that something significant is being discussed;" it is an event. Respectfully, a button press does not constitute identifying a participant directive as recited in the pending claims.

Ludwig et al. describe a multimedia collaboration system that closely approximates the experience of face-to-face collaboration. They describe a process of combining multiple video signals 112-1 to 112-n to produce a combined mosaic signal 36a that is transmitted to individuals. *Col. 12, lines 11 - 20.* Ludwig et al. describe forming a video mosaic by "reduc[ing] the size of the N input video signals by reducing the resolutions of each by a factor of M (where M is the square root of N (i.e., 2, 3, 4, etc.), and then arranging them in an M-by-M mosaic of N images." *Col. 12, lines 14 - 17.* As understood, Ludwig et al. do not show identifying a participant directive as recited in the pending claims.

Neither the reference to Moran et al. nor the reference to Ludwig et al. teach identifying a participant directive wherein the participant directive represents an action on said information as recited in claim 1. Kindly see independent claims 10 and 23 as well. Independent claims 33 and 42 recite "attendee action cues." For the same reasons discussed above, neither the reference to Moran et al. nor the reference to Ludwig et al. teach attendee action cues.

5. The cited references do not teach identifying a participant directive "by analyzing said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing."

A further aspect of the present invention is "identifying a participant directive by analyzing said recorded meeting data while said meeting is ongoing." *Claim 1.* It is correctly noted that Moran et al. do not teach identifying a participant directive while the meeting is ongoing.

Ludwig et al. was cited for allegedly showing this aspect of the invention, however. In particular, the Office action cited the Abstract and Figs. 8B and 8C of Ludwig et al. Figs. 8B and 8C relate to video mosaicing as discussed in column 11, line 65 to column 12, line 54, in connection with Fig. 7. Ludwig et al. describe a process of combining multiple video signals 112-1 to 112-n to produce a combined mosaic signal 36a that is transmitted to individuals. *Col. 12, lines 11 - 20.* Different mosaics may be transmitted to different sites. Fig. 8B shows a mosaic of four participants. Fig. 8C shows "multiple video mosaics."

Ludwig et al. to describe forming a video mosaic comprising live video and then transmitting the mosaic video to various sites. However, a reading of this part of the Ludwig et al. reference does not reveal "identifying a participant directive by analyzing said recorded meeting data." Ludwig et al. do not show that the video signals are analyzed for any purpose other than to form the mosaic video by "reduc[ing] the size of the N input video signals by reducing the resolutions of each by a factor of M (where M is the square root of N (i.e., 2, 3, 4, etc.), and then arranging them in an M-by-M mosaic of N images." *Col. 12, lines 14 - 17.*

For the reasons set forth above, Moran et al. do not teach identifying participant directives. Similarly, Ludwig et al. do not teach identifying participant data. Therefore, the combined teachings of Moran et al. and Ludwig et al. do not suggest identifying participant directives, or that the participant directives are determined by analyzing said recording meeting data, or that such an analysis is performed while said meeting is ongoing. *Claim 1.* Kindly refer to independent claims 10, 23, 33, and 42 as well.

6. The cited references do not show "effectuating said participant directive."

Another aspect of the present invention is "in response to identifying said participant directive, effectuating said participant directive." *Claim 1.* The Office action asserted that "Moran teaches button events initiated by participants during an ongoing meeting ... resulting in addition of the event to the recording." *O.A., page 3, first complete paragraph.* Column 22, lines 12 - 2- were cited in support of the assertion.

Respectfully, "addition of the event to the recording" is not performed in response to the "button events." Rather, "addition of the event to the recording" occurs by virtue of

performing the action of recording the meeting, during which time a participant presses a button. This compares with the recited step of "recording activities among participants during said meeting to produce recorded meeting data." *Claim 1.* The recording of the "button event" of Moran et al., therefore, does not constitute "effectuating said participant directive" is performed "in response to identifying said participant directive."

The Office action further asserted that "each button event [is] indicative of a directive." *O.A., page 3, first complete paragraph.* As recited in claim 1, "said participant directive represent[s] an action on said information." However, Moran et al. describe "a button that may be depressed when the participant feels that something significant is being discussed." *Col. 22, lines 14 - 16.* Respectfully, the button event merely indicates the occurrence of an event; it does not represent an action that is performed on the information, and therefore the button event does not constitute a participant directive.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Section 103 rejection of the claims is believed to be overcome. All claims pending in this Application are believed to be in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

George B. F. Yee
Reg. No. 37,478

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
GBFY:cmm:mmb
60140928 v1